

Control by Legislation

Shortt
HD
9049
•W5S3

PRESSBOARD
PAMPHLET BINDER
Manufactured by
GAYLORD BROS. Inc.
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.

Shortt
HD
9049
W553



100% CONTROL BY LEGISLATION

ADDRESS *by*
AARON SAPIRO

TOGETHER WITH

- 1.—Amplification of Some Points of His
Main Address.
- 2.—Questions and Answers at Different
Meetings.
- 3.—Statement of Pres. H. W. Wood,
U.F.A., and Reply by Aaron Sapiro.

Issued by
Publicity and Research Department, U.F.C.

Material prepared by
G. J. Johnson, 1818 Scarth Street,
Regina, Sask.



Shortt Library

INDEX

SECTION ONE:

	Page
Mr. Sapiro's Main Speech.....	3-12

SECTION TWO:

Development of Certain Points of

Main Speech at certain meetings:

Future of 100 Percent Voluntary Pool.....	13
Voluntary Pool at its Maximum.....	13
Producer and Consumer Co-operation.....	13
How to Secure Legislation.....	14
Dominion Wide Pool.....	14
Interest of Non-Pooler.....	14
The Pool and Over-Production.....	14
Farmers' Credits Co-operative.....	15
Royal Grain Inquiry Commission.....	15

SECTION THREE:

Questions answered by Mr. Sapiro.....	16-19
---------------------------------------	-------

SECTION FOUR:

Mr. Sapiro and Henry Wise Wood.....	20-24
-------------------------------------	-------

95016
17/3/49

SECTION I.

MR. SAPIRO'S SPEECH ON 100 PERCENT POOL CONTROL BY LEGISLATION

WE are here today to discuss one hundred percent pool by legislation for Saskatchewan, and it is well that we first of all quite understand what we mean by that term, to find out why I come here to advocate it and to look at some of the objections that are raised against it.

The proposal has not been put into any final form because, when you are dealing with any law, you cannot write the law in advance. All you can do is to determine principles of the law. You take it to the legislature where it is put into exact shape.

There is some difference of opinion as to the proportion necessary for a sign-up. I believe that 65 percent sign-up may be sufficient. There are those who think it should be 60 percent or 75 percent. I am not going to quarrel with the details of any law. I wish to discuss the principle and assume, if you support it with sufficient strength, your legislature will put it into the exact shape best fitted for Saskatchewan.

What is the principle of the one hundred percent pool by legislation? I recommend and advocate, without reservation, that when two-thirds of the wheat growers of this province sign up a term contract with the pool and say they want co-operative marketing through that pool, that every grower in the province will be compelled by law to deliver his wheat to that pool.

Is that good? Why do people get roused against it?

Saskatchewan is entirely an agricultural province. You are not a mixed agricultural and industrial state like Illinois. Your primary industry is agriculture, and when a policy is adopted by the great majority of the farmers of the province, it is the business of the whole province. It becomes the policy of the province. It is not as though agriculture is a little section of Saskatchewan. Agriculture is the very heart and whole being of Saskatchewan and when there is any one great method that is selected by the large majority of farmers of Saskatchewan as the way in which they want to do business, that, in my opinion, is the agricultural policy of Saskatchewan.

In all Anglo-Saxon countries where majority rule is followed, it is universally agreed that the majority determines the policy. The most important thing Saskatchewan will ever face is the choice between complete co-operative marketing on the one hand and a half-baked co-operation and a lot of speculation on the other.

You have done wonders with what you have. You have done some remarkable things with fifty-five percent co-operation in this province. You have built up a machine that has handled wheat fairly well and acquired almost 1,500 elevators and compelled real changes in the grading laws. Most important of all, you have built up a wonderful change in the spirit of your farmers.

Do you remember the first time I came among you? I do. At those first meetings I used to see large audiences of farmers who had lost faith in themselves because all the power was in the hands of the men who bought what they produced. But I do not see that today. I see men today who have the air of independence. I see men who say "my

business is in my own hands." They have learned that we can hire men to do our business for us.

Men, you have learned that your business is your business. You have learned to control it as a fundamental policy. The change shows in your faces. That is the biggest thing the pool has done.

I am for the pool. I believe your pool has done wonderful work. It has not done one-third of what it could do if it were a universal pool instead of a part pool, constantly hampered by the action of the non-pooler throwing his weight against your pool.

Wherever men deal in wheat they do not think in terms of so many bushels out of Saskatchewan. They think in terms of the commodity as a whole. In the last two months you have seen the price of your wheat advance nearly seventy cents a bushel. What did it? Men living in Liverpool, the Argentine, Chicago, Winnipeg, and other world grain trading centres, viewed a world's wheat supply. They saw that six countries of the world would be able to export some wheat. The export surplus is around one billion bushels. Canada will have about a sixty percent crop. So they started in on a mad scramble to buy wheat and shot up the price. What were they thinking of? They were thinking of wheat, the great commodity of which, when there is an absence of 250,000,000 bushels, would send the price up to an advance of over sixty percent.

Everyone on the other side of you thinks in terms of wheat as a commodity, a total commodity, and when they figure what they can do with wheat they figure in terms of volume. They say: If we can get 500,000,000 bushels, the world is at our control. If we can get 100,000,000 bushels we can still do some good. The big wheat dealers of the world think only in terms of volume and I want the farmers of Saskatchewan to think in terms of the whole commodity.

Why did you make good with your pool? Do you think you had some special genius of selling or some extraordinary deity working out your internal problems? You had good straight men, but they were just straight good men. You had fifty-five percent of the crop: you had some volume; you could hold back some from the world's markets. You are going to make a lot of money on last season's hold-over. Whatever strength you have had in your pool has been that of 200,000,000 bushels of wheat, and the men who sell and control the marketing of that amount have power in their hands. They can affect markets, minimise dumping and stabilise prices.

If all that can be done with fifty-five percent of the wheat, what do you think can be done with one hundred percent of the wheat? What could you do if you had all the wheat of Saskatchewan under your control and part of the wheat of Alberta and Manitoba? If you had all the wheat of Canada in one office, do you not realise you would have more than forty percent of the entire exportable surplus wheat of the world in normal years? And if you had that running out from one controlled office you would be the biggest factor in the world in naming what price should be paid for wheat, provided you named it fair and within proper buying powers of the great consumers of the world.

The difference between fifty-five percent control and one hundred percent control means all the difference between standing on the side lines of the game and getting into the game yourself and winning that game through your energy and power and control of the commodity.

Men, you can thank your stars that wheat fell this year to one dollar, because your pool had to carry the wheat over. A shortage in this year's crop threw the price up and the carry-over of last year will be sold at a magnificent price with a profit. The pool handled fairly well what circumstances compelled them to handle, and they had enough vol-

time to be selling some all the year and have a carry-over when the high price fever struck Canada. Volume brought you result.

If you create enough power to get one hundred percent control pool operating in this province, what your pool has done will be nothing as compared with what it can do.

Who will be hurt or affected or hung? You will hurt and affect and hang every speculator; you will put him out of business as far as the handling of actual wheat is concerned. Have you a right to do that? Any province has the right to say we will take the policy of co-operation as against that of speculation. For years the speculator has been in charge of the marketing of the farmers' wheat, and your turn has now come. They have had their chance and they have failed you. They got the money, but they failed from the standpoint of Saskatchewan and her farmers.

They have had a hundred chances year after year. You did not benefit. Why do you not give yourselves a chance for a period of say, five years of one hundred percent co-operation? Why do not the speculators urge it on you if they think you cannot run it successfully? Give yourselves a chance for five years at complete co-operation, control of your commodity. If you do there will never be a day within one hundred years when a speculator will handle Saskatchewan wheat, because you will find that real control of your crop will mean real prosperity for the farmers. Every business man will get the benefit of it. When the farmers get money they spend it in their district; they improve their homes; they buy new machinery; they use the money for the purpose of securing a better kind of living, and the whole province prospers.

I urge this policy for the whole province for the farm class, which is the dominant class, and all the other classes, because they likewise benefit when the farmer profits from any improvement in the system.

Is this proposed legislation against the spirit of co-operation? I am still for co-operation. I would like to get one hundred percent of the farmers of Saskatchewan signed up of their own free will in the pool. But they just will not come in. You have given them six years of successful administration in the pool. If they do not want to come into the pool I do not want to drag them in. I want to pull more wheat into the pool. If these men will not become co-operators, make their wheat co-operative. Am I taking away any of the spirit of co-operation when I urge that? I want the non-pooler to stand where a law compels delivery from the outside. It takes nothing away from the man who has the spirit of co-operation but adds something decent to the man outside.

I am for co-operative marketing without reservation and without limitation, but more important, I am for control of the commodity that the farmers raise by the farmers who raise it, and I am for the absolute elimination of even part of that control by those who have a financial interest in breaking down your great pools. I am for co-operation as a means to an end. The end is the absolute control of your own wheat by the farmers who raise it in whatever technical method they think is the best method of control.

Who will be hurt by this proposal? No one, really. The private elevators will not be hurt because they will merely have to change their system to meet the proposal. The farmers will benefit and every man in the province because with more money you have more things to buy. You will have more dollars and everyone in Saskatchewan will benefit from the change. It will not hurt anyone who has not a right to be hurt. It will help everyone in Saskatchewan who has a right to be helped.

There are, of course, arguments being used against this plan, and

many for it. I am not surprised that the dealers and those associated with them fight this proposal. They should. It will be their finish. Their hands will slide out of your pockets when this becomes a reality. But I am shocked when farm leaders fight this one movement that would take the dealer and his friends off the neck of the co-operators and would give the true co-operators in spirit their first real chance to show how profitable as well as right their system can be.

Some of the leaders have been suggesting to delegates that the one hundred percent pool would hurt the pool with bankers. And then they blow the other way and suggest that it would stand in the way if the growers ever wanted to develop any banking system of their own.

They must know better than that. If the growers ever wanted their own banking system, nothing would help it more than to have all the wheat in the province controlled by the one co-operative and all the business of all that wheat poured into the one great bank. I do not now recommend such a step; but if you wanted it, the one hundred percent pool would make it safe.

If they refer only to our present banking arrangements surely the pool would be better for the banks if it controlled all the wheat rather than only about fifty-five percent. The banks lend you money. On what? On your looks? They may be good but they are not as good as collateral. What is the best collateral? Your wheat. They arrange to lend you, for example, one dollar on every bushel of wheat and you pay six percent interest for the loan. But they want to make sure they are safe so they add that these loans depend on the value of wheat as established by the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. You must keep a margin, say, fifteen cents, perhaps twenty cents a bushel.

Suppose the Winnipeg price is \$1.15 a bushel. You would get \$1. Then if the price goes to \$1.20 you get no greater advance. But if it goes to \$1.05 what happens? The banks get busy. The manager gets on the telephone and calls up the pool manager and says: "Here, you have borrowed \$30,000,000 on 30,000,000 bushels of wheat. You have to keep a 15c margin. Wheat is dropping. You have to put up \$3,000,000 right away or 3,000,000 bushels of wheat. Do it now. If you have not got the money, sell 3,000,000 bushels of wheat and get the money." So the pool would have to dump that on the market that is already going down, so as to make sure that the bank has its margin of safety on your wheat.

Many directors of the banks that lend your pool money are interested in grain trading. They know the terms of these loans. They know when you need money and when you have not got it. Suppose they want to hurt the pool and get your wheat cheap? Who knows an easier way than to buy wheat from non-poolers, throw 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 bushels on Winnipeg, break the market, make the banks call on you for money or wheat, make you sell five or six million bushels quickly, buy that wheat at low price and make you learn what the dealers' ability to manipulate markets has always cost the grower.

If you had control of all the wheat they could not throw the outsiders' wheat on the market to break your price. Your collateral would be better and the ultimate value of your wheat stronger and higher.

But bankers want your business nowadays and they want it to be safe. It's good business. It's profitable business. One great banking house in the United States offered to one of the pool representatives and myself anything around a hundred million as a loan against wheat for your ordinary marketing needs at a rate slightly less than you were about to pay in Canada. With distinguished courtesy they took it up with Canadian banks and were advised in writing that their participation was not necessary and that the Canadian banks preferred to handle the loans direct all by themselves.

That is the right attitude and I do not believe the Canadian banks will change. The collateral will be far better and the danger of reduction of margin will be decreased with each percentage of control that you acquire. From every banking standpoint you will improve your position by any method that will give the pool control of the handling of one hundred percent of the wheat grown in this province.

Then it is argued that the grain exchange would still exist, that there would still be gambling on paper and the credit of the province would be affected. This objection is no good. I have already pointed out how the banking end is run. I have already shown you what the banks could do if they wanted to. Right now you are vulnerable. If you had the one hundred percent pool there would be no cash wheat except what you have. Would you not then like them to sell you short, sell down your market? You would sit there and say you have sold some wheat, now deliver it. Directly they tried to break your market by selling short, that instant they are yours and you could take your time to pick their bones.

Then there's the old cry that this proposal will put the pool into politics. Those who oppose this plan will tell you that I have often said that the pool must not permit government interference. I have said that and I still say it. I want the politicians to stay out of the pool and I want the pool to stay out of politics.

How would such a law as I propose put the pool into politics? The pool would still be managed by its own directors, elected only by its own members; the non-poolers would receive the services of the pools and should pay every deduction, including elevator deductions. Their stock could be held for them by the directors as trustees. Only the members would vote. The control of the pool would stay just where it is now, in the general membership. No change would happen except that the pool, controlled by the farmer members only, would handle all of the wheat grown in this province and would double its service to all the growers of that wheat.

At the end of the contract term, the growers would again decide whether or not they desire to have the pool continue such control. If a majority failed to sign the contracts, you would go back to the speculative dealer control. If the necessary majority would sign again, you would stay with the 100 percent delivery to the pool. There's no room for politics there, is there?

I don't know whether this is what the opponents to this plan mean, that to ask for such legislation puts the pool into politics. If so, that's a strange idea. Every class of citizen goes boldly to your legislature to demand what they think their industry needs. Bankers, manufacturers, insurance companies, railroads, all have particular laws applying to them exclusively. These laws are usually good laws, good for the whole country, because they are good for a necessary class of industry in the country without doing harm to any fundamental ideal or any similarly important class in the Dominion.

Why should not the farmers use the legislative branch of government to make it possible for the farmers to control and run their own business, one hundred percent of it, in their own co-operative way? They are not asking the government to run their business. They are not asking the government to make dealers run the farmers' business. They are demanding that a law be enacted which will put the dealers out of that business and will permit the growers of wheat to handle all the wheat grown in the province for the benefit of the growers of that wheat.

Who will profit? All the growers. Who will profit from them? All the business in the province. Every merchant who has sales to make will find more dollars ready for his wares and merchandise. There will be more money for taxes to help government.

Who will suffer? Only the speculative dealer.

Wheat growing is the fundamental industry on the prairies. You cannot benefit the wheat grower without helping the whole province. This is, not legislation for a class. This is legislation for the good of every single person in the province and the entire chance and cost of it is carried by only the wheat growing class. The farmers have a right to ask for any legislation that is right, and this suggested law is legislation good for the farmer and for the entire dominion. You are not putting the pool into politics. You are asking the use of the legislative power to permit the farmers to give their own pool a chance for full and complete success.

Then there is the report of the grain commission which was made public a few days ago and which I have studied. Their report was a splendid report. It is worth reading and you all should read it because you will be as puzzled as I am when you have read it as to why they omitted any real discussion of the motive or purpose of the suggestion for a one hundred percent pool.

What does this report say? It says, first of all, that the Commissioners had been requested by some farmers to express themselves on the subject; that they did so with some hesitation because they knew the pool delegates had voted by a large majority against the proposal; that they would have preferred the delegates to have passed a resolution asking them to advise them in the matter, but since this had not been done they intended to consider the question and express their views because the subject was beginning to be one of controversy among the farmers of the province.

Then they say that there are two things to consider: first, is the proposal a good thing, and second, what should be the proper method of getting 100 percent pool control. They say that pool members want 100 percent control but that they observe a difference of opinion as to how it should be accomplished. They speak of the great work done by the pool and that if that good work is continued the farmers will flock into it. They say that when you get a 90 percent or 85 percent pool you have everything you want because the 10 percent still outside will not mean very much. Then they say they are against this legislative method because it exists in British Columbia, British South Africa, Australia and Queensland, but that in all of these places there is some place where the government is interested. They say they are against the 100 percent pool by legislation because they are against government interference.

Can you imagine anything like that? Can you imagine these Commissioners, kind, sincere gentlemen, being so naive as to believe that men are different here to what they are anywhere else? Do they really believe that the farmers will fall over themselves to join the pool because it is a good thing? They have had the experience of six years of the pool in front of them and 55 percent control after those years and after the splendid work done by the pool. They know that 45 percent of the farmers are still outside the pool despite the great work accomplished.

But nowhere does this commission give an argument as to why the 100 percent pool is a real necessity for men who are trying to put the control of a product in the hands of the men who grow it. Nor do they discuss why the control of the commodity is necessary before you will achieve the thing we set out to accomplish. All they say is, more good can be accomplished from 100 percent pool than from a 55 percent pool.

They seem to think it is a question of degree of improvement. It is a wholly different story because with control of the wheat of Canada you make a price. With control of 55 percent you do good work, but the non-pooler makes your price and you take what he, plus the speculator, chooses to have you take.

Men, when I read that report I said it is the work of good, kind, sincere men. They do not want the farmers to take a course hastily. They say the proposal is beset with dangers and difficulties, so keep out. Do they think and are they so naive as to think that you can by persuasion get more men to join you?

Then they quote a statement from Alexander Legge, recently appointed chairman of the United States Farm Loan Board, which has been given \$500,000,000 to spend to assist the farmers. Many of us were shocked when we read Mr. Legge's statement. He said that some 2,000,000 farmers in the United States were members of some 1,200 co-operative organizations but he made no allowance for the fact that thousands of these farmers belong to many different organizations. Mr. Legge, in this statement quoted by the commission, said that patience should be followed by the poolers in dealing with the non-pooler and that in the course of time the pooling method would sell itself to the man outside.

Men, the failure of hundreds of co-operative organizations in the United States is due wholly to the fact that the whole of the successful ones could not compare in their power with that exercised by the non-pooler all the way from Maine to California in the effort to break up the pools.

This new farm loan board recognises this fact very clearly because they have laid down two fundamental principles upon which they will loan money for farm relief; first, they will deal only with co-operatives, and, second, will only lend money on that basis to those who have a maximum of commodity under control.

The view expressed by your Commission that the man outside the pool will come in when the pool has made good is an entirely erroneous impression. The history of co-operative organisations in the United States is an absolute denial of the statement often made that when the pools make good those outside come in. When they do make good and stabilise prices the fellows on the outside say: "Why should I join?" They say to the co-operatives: "You do the work for me but I am not going to work for you."

There are many examples of this and perhaps the most outstanding one is the Burley Tobacco Association, which pool controlled all the Burley tobacco of Kentucky and other states. They had a membership much greater than your pool, 107,000 members. The pool made good. They graded the tobacco in different grades, such as C1, C2, C3 and so on. The association increased the price to the tobacco grower an average of eighty percent over corresponding prices against corresponding commercial conditions.

Somewhere around 20 and 30 percent of the tobacco growers stood outside the pool. The speculator bought from these outsiders at fancy prices. The result was that the outsider got the benefit and finally ruined the pool. The pool was killed by the fringe of outsiders controlled by the speculators. They broke the Burley price and the Burley spirit and today the pool is dismantling. It is merely a paper co-operative association with 107,000 members all dressed up and no place to go.

How did they do it? When the first contract period closed they got ready to launch their campaign for the second sign-up. I was sent for as I had been intimately concerned with the pool right from the start. I met these men, all of them big men, vitally interested in the pool. I said to them: Let's get down to this thing and work out our campaign. They said to me: We are not going to sign the contract. I could not understand them. I said: What's wrong? Hasn't the pool made good?

Yes.

Hasn't it raised the price for you growers?

Yes.

Hasn't the management been good?

Yes.

Then what's wrong?

They said: We admit all that, but we are not going to sign the contract. We are not going to go on and give these fellows who stand outside the benefit of our work and of our organization.

But, I said to them, that's child's talk. Men don't talk like that. Don't you realize you are cutting off your nose to spite your face?

Yes, they said. We admit all that, but we are not going to sign the contract with these fellows outside ruining our pool and ruining the spirit and morale of our members.

There was the situation. Despite the fact that the pool had raised the price eighty percent, these men would not sign the contract because of the non-pooler. They told me of what had been going on. The poolers' tobacco would be graded, say C3, and he would get twelve or fifteen cents a pound for it with an advance payment of, say nine cents, deductions made, and so on, and the rest of the payments later on.

The non-pooler would come into town with his tobacco. The speculator would come along and look at the tobacco and say to the non-pooler: That's mighty fine tobacco you've got there, Jim. It looks like C3 to me—although he knew very well it was not C3. I'll give you eighteen cents a pound for it, cash, right now, and I'll mark the cheque for C3 tobacco and certify it for you.

The non-pooler would take his cheque marked for C3 tobacco and rush across to the bank with it and get his money spot cash. Then he walked over-town and met a pooler. "What are you going to get for your tobacco?" he asked. "Oh, about 12 or 15 cents," would be the reply. "Look at me," said the non-pooler. "I got 18 cents for my C3, cash. I got a certified cheque and I've got the cash. I don't have to take nine cents now and have a lot of deductions taken off, and then have to wait for a year or perhaps two years for the rest. How do you know you'll get the rest of your money, or when you'll get it? I've got mine."

Then the non-pooler went home and gave his wife some money and very soon she got a new dress or a new hat, and the pooler's wife would go to him and say: "Why can't you get 18 cents for your tobacco and get it all at once? If you did, then I could get a new dress or a new hat like the non-pooler's wife does."

Men, that's what broke the Burley tobacco pool, for when they went out on the second term contract they came back with 25,000 signatures. That was not enough to keep the pool going. They are selling their warehouses. They are still an incorporate entity but their spirit is broken, the pool is smashed.

These men I went to see told me they were sick and tired of making these non-poolers. They said they would not stand for it, and that's why the Burley tobacco pool was smashed.

The same thing applied to the California fruit pool, with 25 percent standing outside, receiving a better average price than the pool exchange. I wish I could feel and say that all you have to do is to build up a good pool and then the outsider will come in. He won't. I wish I could feel that that was human nature. But it isn't. Men do not work that way. They see the pool at work; they see the good it does and they say—someone else pays for it, I will stand outside and get the benefit of it.

Is that not what is happening right here in Saskatchewan? You have a great pool. It has done and is doing great work. But you have these outsiders who are reaping the benefit and do not take any part of the responsibility on their shoulders.

Over 45 percent of the crop is not delivered to the pools. Who stands outside? Well, first of all there is the distressed farmer. He owes money everywhere, to the banker or the dealer who will not let him sign up with the co-operatives. He is so involved that he cannot do anything, and for him all we can have is sympathy. Some day a farmers' credit organization will take him out of hock and give him the chance to be free again and to develop freedom with his fellow co-operatives.

Second, there is the prejudiced man. He doesn't like the word "co-operative," or he doesn't like me or the color of my hair or something like that. He has never let reason consider the situation. His mind has been made up by some petty bias. He cannot be convinced. The only thing to do with him is to take the axe to him, and you do not do things like that in Saskatchewan.

Third, there is the stubborn man. He says he won't join, and he won't. His wife heard him say so and he has to keep her regard for his strength of mind. He won't change and won't learn. Along comes the speculator and says you're a man after my own heart. You've got sense you have. You don't have to do what these other fellows do. You're an independent man. You're sensible you are. You don't need this co-operative stuff to make up your mind for you. You're too smart for that. You're a sensible fellow you are. You're the kind that has made Britain what she is. You're the backbone of the British Empire. And then this piece of Britain's backbone throws out his chest, struts around like a peacock, proud of his great independent spirit, and lets the co-operators do all the work of saving him from bad prices and bad grading from this very speculative dealer.

There's only one thing to do with the stubborn man. Feed him hay.

Then there's the fourth class, the untaught man. He simply cannot get this thing. He has not learned what it is all about. He just doesn't understand. The pool has been operating for over five years and he has had a chance to learn but somehow he doesn't quite click on it. You give him this long contract and you tell him about deductions for this and that, for elevators, reserves, and so on and by this time his head is swimming all around and he just does not seem to grasp it all. The only thing to do with him is go on trying and may be in ten years or so he will catch on to all of it.

There is a fifth class. All these four put together do not come anywhere near the number of this fifth and worst class—the umbrella man. He's the kind that sees Brouillette or Williams going down the street under a big umbrella and says I'll sneak in underneath this and won't get wet but I'll not do anything to help hold the umbrella up. He knows the pool is good. If you said you were going to drop the pool he'd go down on his knees and beg you not to. He openly boasts that the pool has made money for him. He stands by and laughs at the co-operators but he won't pay one cent of the cost of the pool. He sneaks in under your umbrella and takes the benefit of your work and pays nothing. But he does worse than that. He sends all his wheat to dealers who throw it against the pool. He hurts you for trying to help him. He hurts himself because he helps to lower the basic price of his own wheat.

For the umbrella man more than any other class this legislation is necessary. It will make more money for him. It will give him a chance to win back his self-respect. It will make him contribute a little to pay for the great dollars he gains through you. It will help you to have his wheat and it will take nothing from him except his shame at being an umbrella man. It will encourage that spirit by showing great profits as well as fine manhood in this great co-operative movement.

By this time you should have had sufficient experience to realise that you cannot bring these outsiders into the pool by waiting until their conscience tells them the pool is a good thing. There has been a period

of six years of demonstration of what the pool can do and there has been no demonstration of a rush from the non-poolers to sign up and join. You cannot do this thing in a sentimental way. Co-operation here is near to its maximum at the present time, nearer than many of you realise, and if you want to get co-operative results at their maximum you have got to add to the spirit of co-operation something of the spirit of universal legislation.

I am for taking all these classes of non-poolers and putting their wheat into one great pool. I do not favor either the government or the non-pooler being represented on the board of control. No minority group of directors could do anything with the board anyway. The real protection for the non-pooler would be that whatever deduction was made from his wheat is also made from that of the co-operators, and whatever price they get he gets. There is no protection so strong as community of interest and I favor the pool run and managed by the co-operators themselves.

I bring to you a suggestion with British precedents. The only countries in the world that have this kind of legislation are British. They are British Columbia, British South Africa, Australia and Queensland. I am not worrying about the details of the law. If you want this legislation you can get it by asking for it.

You want to run your own business without being continually stabbed in the back by the non-pooler, to run it without hate or envy or jealousy, with a spirit of service. You have a right to these things, to a sense of security as well as of buying a decent standard of living. I am fighting so that you will fight to get these things, so that you will co-operate to a maximum extent and that when you have exhibited that co-operation you will use the power of legislation to help you do good for the non-co-operator and to help you nail down and improve a great work which you have already done for yourselves through bona fide decent co-operation in Saskatchewan.

This is not a question of dollars alone. I have told you before that I look upon dollars as interpreting different phases of life. I know what money means to send a boy or girl to high school or university, to give the farmer a better standard of living, to obtain better medical attention, things to read, things for the housewife, to give more assistance to the church. I think of money as translated into decent forms of life and I want more money to be translated into better forms of living all through the farms of Saskatchewan.

The way to get it is not to sit there and twiddle your thumbs and say I know a good word "co-operation," I know a good thing, the pool. They are good by themselves. They have done something. They have paved the way. They are on the right track and if you want that co-operation and that pool to reach its goal, remember that goal is 100 percent control of the wheat of Saskatchewan by the men who raise that wheat and are interested in its intelligent marketing.

You will never get it by waiting. You will never get it by wishing. You will only get it by a big corps of co-operation. Two-third co-operators pouring their wheat into a pool and a law compelling the non-poolers to put their wheat in the co-operative pool. If you cause that law to be enacted you will do more in three years for the people of Saskatchewan than all the farmers' movements combined have done in the last 30 years and they have done good work.

I close by repeating my loyal admiration for what the pool has done. I say nothing in criticism of it. With the 55 percent of wheat they have done wonderful work. They have not done all that should be done. But if you give them two-third co-operation and the other one-third wheat in the co-operative pool they will achieve every one of our promises and they will have transformed Saskatchewan into a true wheat growers' paradise. You can do it and if you will set your wills, you will do it.

SECTION II.

DEVELOPMENT OF CERTAIN POINTS IN MR. SAPIRO'S ADDRESS AT DIFFERENT POINTS IN THE PROVINCE

At ESTEVAN: (Sept. 18, 1929):

Future of 100 Percent Pool Voluntarily

"If you wait until 1959 your pool will still be handling between 55 percent and 60 percent of the crop and you will still have the same non-poolers, the same outsiders, in the same five classes, and you will be exactly where you are today."

* * *

At KERROBERT: (Sept. 20, 1929):

Voluntary Pool at Maximum

"Your pool is too precious a thing to have it shot to pieces by the non-pooler. Your pool is at its maximum now. Your pool is on its way either to paralysis or to the end reached by the Burley Tobacco Pool."

Producer and Consumer Co-operation

"I am told that a couple of eminent leaders of the consumers' co-operatives of England were here and that they stated they knew everything there was to know about the consumer co-operation and that they were amazed to even hear about the pool considering such an idea of legislation.

"That may be true but there is a problem in producers' co-operation. Perhaps they realised that if you had a 100 percent pool in Canada you would control over 40 percent of the entire exportable surplus of all the countries of the world and you would be the one dominant factor in naming the price of wheat. Perhaps they thought that you would forget that they are among your biggest buyers and will be one of your big purchasers unless the new government in England buys all the imported wheat through one government office. Perhaps they forgot that they have an interest in keeping the price down instead of forcing it upwards.

"But may be, they spoke with thought only of you. If so then all I can say is that they may know all about consumers' co-operation but they may still not be qualified to advise on producer co-operation.

"I talk the language of producer co-operation. What is the vital difference between these two types of co-operation? Consumers' co-operatives are essentially local in character. They depend on local stores, local patronage, local competition. What happens in Wales will not wreck a store in London. That movement is wholly local in operation and achievement. Producers' co-operatives must depend on the commodity, not on locality. It is wheat that concerns you, not wheat in Kerrobert alone, but wheat from all over the world. When they break the price of your wheat they say it is because there is too much wheat, not in your field, but all over Canada, all over the great prairies. You cannot run a producer organisation, co-operation, unless you think in terms of the commodity, in terms of volume, entire production, competition all over the world. Locality is the word for consumer co-operation; commodity for producer co-operation.

From my experience in observing producer co-operatives' successes and failures, I tell you that this proposal would do more in one year to make your co-operative serve every grower in the province, co-operator or mere deliverer, in raising the price basis, in settling petty disputes on grades and mixing, in bringing harmony of good-feeling into Saskatchewan than all the work of a 60 percent co-operative in 20 years."

* * *

At ROSETOWN: (Sept. 23, 1929):

How to Secure Legislation

"Your government institutes policies on all kinds of subjects. You should see that it declares an agricultural policy for Saskatchewan as a whole. No government dare refuse this legislation if you ask for it. Here is the way to do it: instruct your delegates to fight for this proposal. Have meetings throughout your district to give your delegates that instruction. Make them go down to Regina and vote for it. If they do that and there is a sufficient number they can pass a resolution instructing the directors of the pool to go to the legislature and call upon it to enact such legislation. If the pool asks for it with the Saskatchewan Section of the United Farmers of Canada, no government dare refuse it you."

* * *

At HUMBOLDT: (Sept. 24, 1929):

Dominion Wide Pool

"If Saskatchewan ever adopts the proposal of 100 percent pool co-operative control it will be followed by the other western provinces. It will push its way through the Dominion until every man in Canada raising wheat will be compelled to dispose of it through a Dominion wheat marketing control office, the wheat of one man controlled through one agency becoming the biggest factor in the wheat world in the matter of price setting."

The Interest of the Non-Pooler

"In this district one of the arguments that is being used against the proposal is that the non-pooler having no representation on the management board is akin to taxation without representation. That is not so, because under this scheme the non-pooler is in exactly the same position as the pooler.

"It is also being said that the University of Saskatchewan is opposed to the proposal. Again that is not so. Your University does not take sides in controversial matters. Individuals at the University may have opinions but these men in the Humboldt district who are making these statements know they are false and if they are in this room I dare them to make the charges in my presence."

The Pool and Over-Production

"Some people around this district are talking of over-production and the pool. This much is certain: if you only have 55 percent control that will not stop over-production. You would have a much better chance if you had 100 percent control. One of these days if over-production should continue it might be necessary to establish primary and secondary pool methods, primary to represent the normal acreage and secondary to dispose of the over-produced grain after that in the primary pool has been disposed of."

At SEMANS: (Sept. 25, 1929):

Farmers Credit Co-operative

"One of these days you may wake up and create a big farmers' credit co-operative association. When you get 100 percent control through a 100 percent pool it will be safe. It is not safe at the present time because your markets are not stabilised. When you get 100 percent pool control you will create your own credit co-operative association instead of keeping the distressed farmer from his own movement. He cannot get into it at present because he is snowed under. You will enable him to join by co-operative credits. Once you get 100 percent pool control, a marketing control pool, your next move will be to create a big co-operative credit system under which you will take control of farmers' credits during production, acquiring lands and farms and part of the credits to handle mortgages."

The Royal Grain Inquiry Commission

"The advice of this commission that the farmers should go slowly in this matter because it is beset with difficulty and danger is clever advice and is as bad as it is clever. They should have said in their report why the 100 percent pool is necessary in order to enable you to have something to say in the making of the price for your product. On that point they were silent."

* * *

At MELVILLE: (Sept. 26, 1929):

See last section of this report, under heading of "Mr. Sapiro and Henry Wise Wood."

SECTION III.

QUESTIONS PUT TO MR. SAPIRO DURING HIS SASKATCHEWAN TOUR AT ESTEVAN, KERROBERT, ROSETOWN, HUMBOLDT, SEMANS AND MELVILLE, AND HIS ANSWERS THERETO

At ESTEVAN:

Q.—How will we get the legislature to pass such a law?

A.—If your U.F.C. and pool decide to utilise this law you want to agitate in every district that elects men to your legislature and have these men know you want this law passed. If the farmers really use their power of control, 80 percent of the vote in the legislature, it will not take long to get the law passed.

Q.—Does this legislation rest wholly with the provincial legislature?

A.—Not being a Canadian lawyer I would not care to give an opinion off hand. I have seen a legal opinion prepared by an eminent Canadian lawyer that you do not need federal legislation.

Note: Many questions were asked at all these meetings which had in reality been dealt with by Mr. Sapiro during his address. They are therefore not reported.

* * *

At ROSETOWN:

Q.—Do you realise that by this proposal of yours you are interfering with my business?

A.—Are you a non-pooler?

Q.—Yes.

A.—Then I am delighted to be interfering with your business.

Q.—Are you a British subject?

A.—No.

Q.—What right have you to come here among those of us who have lived here for years before there was a pool and own our land and produce our crop? You are trying to work up an agitation in our province whereby the majority will trample down the minority.

A.—No, my friend. I am trying to bring forward a proposal which will permit the majority to lift the minority up.

Q.—Do you think the farmers today would have been as well off financially if the wheat board had been continued?

A.—It is possible but you would not have been as well off in spirit. Governments should not be called upon to do what the farmers can do for themselves. If the wheat board had been in existence today the farmers would likely be getting as much money as they do today but they would have been poorer in spirit. That is why I like the idea of a co-operative organisation complete run by the farmers but with the power of a wheat board.

Q.—What will the grain trade do?

A.—They'll fight. I don't know how they will fight but you can bet they will not take this thing lying down. Right in this district men have been going round telling the farmers that they will fight against this proposal as delegates. They try to justify their position by giving all kinds of reasons. Look at it this way: if you were in the grain trade facing this proposal would you not be ready to put a couple of

million dollars into a fund to fight it? How do you know how the grain trade is going to fight this thing? They do not come out to you and tell you who they are. They are too clever for that. I don't know how they are working. Every time you go into a big fight like this on some public principle you have to keep our people in sight every minute of the time. You have got to give them instructions and see they carry them out.

Q.—That is an insinuation that some of the farmers of this district have been bought by the grain trade.

A.—How do you know who supplies these people with their arguments? How do I know whether or not men have been planted in this audience to ask these questions? I don't know and I don't care, but I do know the grain trade is very tricky in its fight and you will find that out soon.

Q.—Your statement leaves the suggestion that possibly some of the wheat pool delegates voted the way they did at their meeting because they were influenced by the trade?

A.—Such an inference must not be drawn from what I have said and if that impression has been left I want to correct it now. I think the delegates voted the way they did because they did not have all the information they wanted to vote any other way. Had I been a delegate I would not have voted at all.

Q.—If this legislation passes should the grain trade be paid any compensation?

A.—Certainly not. They have no good will to look after except the immense profits they have made from your product.

Q.—How could the laws of these other countries be adjusted to meet the situation in this province?

A.—We are not required to follow these laws and they are only quoted to you to show that there are precedents for this class of legislation and that they are British. In British South Africa they recently made the law that the government has no control or representation on the board. There is no control by the government in the other cases and even where they have representation it is minority representation and not control representation. You can draw your own law. I would not hesitate to give the non-pooler one-third representation on the board and if that did not work I would have amending legislation to cut out his representation.

Q.—Have the bankers called on you to advise them, because if so you cannot also advise the farmers?

A.—The bankers have called on me to advise them on agricultural matters just as you farmers do. There is only one difference between you: they paid me large fees for advising them and your farmers' organisation did not. I am glad to do it for nothing.

Q.—The government has been controlled by the grain trade for years. How do you expect them to give you this legislation?

A.—The government will not refuse the joint request of the U.F.C. and the wheat pool and there would probably be a special committee of the legislature to draft the law.

Q.—Do you realise that what you propose would do away with the freedom of the country?

A.—No. It would be doing away with what you think is your freedom to hurt the work of men who are building up the province. This proposal will stop the minority wrecking the work of the majority.

Q.—Do you think it just that when a man owns his land and produces his crop that he cannot do what he likes with it?

A.—The majority of the farmers of this province have the right to state what the agricultural policy of Saskatchewan shall be and if the majority decide to have a co-operative policy they have that right.

Q.—You can't get away with this thing; we are not in Russia now?

A.—That is quite true; we are not in Russia now.

* * *

At HUMBOLDT:

When Mr. Sapiro spoke of the field man in this district and his activities, Mr. Osborne Upper, at question time, rose and said: "I want to make my position clear! I have said that so far as 100 percent pool is concerned we all want it but to get it by compulsory methods I do not think it is the best policy because as far as I can see if we had every kernel of wheat in the world in the final analysis international finance will tell you what you will get for it."

Mr. Sapiro replied as follows: "None of us know very much about this international finance stuff. I had a suit in the United States once because it was alleged that I was a representative of the so-called group of Jews doing that. Do not let us get off the track. We could discuss for days these credit systems. Let us stick to what we have, the difference between a 55 percent pool and a 100 percent pool. If the 55 percent pool has no power why did you join it, and if it has power in spite of international finance you would have greater power with 100 percent control."

Mr. UPPER: "I have said this, that the pool started on a shoestring in 1924. Under 55 percent control we have 1,500 elevators, huge reserves. I do not believe it is in the best interests to have legislation and I do not see how you can take a man's grain and say you know enough to grow it but you do not know enough to sell it and I do not think any government will dare grant that legislation to sell his grain for him without any supervision by the government."

Mr. SAPIRO: "Can you imagine a field man making that point? How can he ask any man to join the pool when he says that? If he is working for the pool I would say he should be fired out."

QUESTIONS

Q.—About the Burley tobacco pool. What did the speculator do with the tobacco, to whom did he sell it?

A.—What is your name, may I ask?

Q.—Patterson.

Mr. SAPIRO: Do you belong to the pool?

A.—No.

Mr. SAPIRO: Are you a grower?

A.—A little.

Mr. SAPIRO: Where? *YIPASE!*

A.—None of your business.

Mr. SAPIRO: Oh yes; it is my business. You know all about me and I want to know something about you. However; the speculator took that non-pool tobacco and sold it to the big buyers against the pool, just as being done by you non-poolers in Saskatchewan. Have you any more questions?

A.—No.

Q.—What about the line elevators? What would you do if they held you up on a sale?

A.—Declare them to be public utilities and use them for storage when you need them.

Q.—Why does the pool hold a seat on the grain exchange?

A.—I don't want to go into a lot of detail about the work of the pool because this is not the place. But I will say this that if 100 per cent control is obtained and the pool then went onto the exchange, they ought to be shot.

* * *

At SEMANS:

At question time, Mr. C. H. Fleming, farmer of Tate, asked a series of questions.

Q.—Why did you come to Saskatchewan in 1923 to urge the formation of a wheat pool when at that time legislation could have been obtained to continue the old wheat board?

A.—I did not then and do not now want government selling of your wheat. I am against the establishment of a wheat board although it would mean the 100 percent pool, because the control of that pool would not be in the hands of the producers but would be in the hands of the government.

Mr. Fleming commenced a lengthy speech but was cried down by the audience. The following remark, however, was caught from Mr. Fleming: "The banks and loan interests, everyone knows, financed the creation of the wheat pool."

Mr. Sapiro replied: "I never believed I would meet a man who took that attitude in connection with the co-operative marketing organisation of the farmers of the province."

Another gentleman indulged in a very lengthy address and wanted to know whether the wheat pool was doing anything in the matter of dockage.

• Mr. Sapiro stated he could not answer that question and suggested the gentleman meet Mr. Brouillette after the meeting and discuss the question with him.

* * *

At MELVILLE:

A few questions were asked at this meeting and have been covered by the replies at other places.



Mount Library

SECTION IV.

MR. SAPIRO AND HENRY WISE WOOD

On September 26, 1929, the following despatch appeared in the Regina Leader as from its special correspondent at Calgary, being an interview with H. W. Wood, president, U.F.A., on Mr. Sapiro's proposal for 100 percent pool by legislation:

Calgary, September 25. (Special Despatch)—H. W. Wood, president of the United Farmers of Alberta and chairman of the Alberta Wheat Pool, brands as "unthinkable" the suggestion advanced by Aaron Sapiro in his Saskatchewan address that when two-thirds of the growers in Saskatchewan are voluntarily enrolled in the Saskatchewan wheat pool, the balance will be brought in by legislation with no representation on the board of control or vote in the conducting of affairs for non-poolers.

Mr. Sapiro is credited with also suggesting further that there be no governmental control, but that the administration of the Saskatchewan pool rest in the hands of the co-operative marketing organisation.

"The proposition from the wheat growers viewpoint has a rather pleasant sound, but from the standpoint of practical application it presents some difficulties that I have never been able to satisfactorily adjust in my own mind," he said.

"In the first place we have two systems of selling grain in western Canada, both recognised by law, each controlled and regulated by legislation," Mr. Wood continued. "If the representatives of the pooling system acknowledge the right of the government to legislate one system out of existence, the government might decide to exercise that right to legislate the pool out of existence. On the other hand, if the government legislates the oldest established grain trade out of existence, by forbidding the growers to make deliveries to that trade, it thereby destroys millions of dollars' worth of property that the trade has been accumulating for years under the sanction of the government.

"Is the trade supposed to lose this property? Is the government supposed to indemnify the trade? Or do the farmers who are asking for this revolutionary method propose to take the responsibility of indemnifying the trade? I might also ask who would indemnify the pool for its property if the government should decide to pass legislation compelling the farmers to deliver all their grain to the old established trade?"

"I cannot conceive of the government undertaking to force the delivery of all grain to any one selling agency without also taking the responsibility, or at least a joint responsibility, of the control of that system. The old Canadian Wheat Board is an example of the simplest method. Neither the farmers nor the government want to revert to any kind of direct government control.

"There are many other complications involved in this proposition affecting both the farmers' interests and the functions of the government, that will have to be carefully considered, both by the farmers and the government before such unprecedented legislation is enacted. To me, such legislation is unthinkable in a free country."

At his Melville meeting, September 26, 1929, Mr. Sapiro replied to this interview of Mr. Wood's in the following language—this being a verbatim report of his reply unedited:

"Mr. Henry Wise Wood of the United Farmers of Alberta and the Alberta Wheat pool, brands as 'unthinkable' the proposal I bring to you that the farmers of Canada should, through a co-operative marketing organisation, control the marketing of the commodity they produce. It is my purpose tonight to reply to Mr. Wood's statement in full detail. His statement appears in the Regina Leader and I will take it point by point and answer each one.

"He first of all says:

To me such legislation is unthinkable in a free country.

"Does he not think it is rather unthinkable that an alleged farm leader should give such an interview?

"Then he says:

The proposition from the wheat growers' viewpoint has a rather pleasant sound but from the standpoint of practical application it presents some difficulties that I have never been able to satisfactorily adjust in my own mind.

"I have no quarrel with that statement.

"Then he says:

In the first place we have two systems of selling grain in western Canada both recognised by law, each controlled and regulated by legislation. If the representatives of the pooling system acknowledge the right of the government to legislate one system out of existence the government might decide to exercise that right to legislate the pool out of existence. On the other hand if the government legislates the oldest established grain trade out of existence by forbidding the growers to make deliveries to that trade, it thereby destroys millions of dollars worth of property that the trade has been accumulating for years under the sanction of government.

"And that's a statement from the 'grand old man of Alberta.' Did you hear what he said? Let me say this: if ever the co-operative system does as much harm to the province of Saskatchewan as I believe the speculative system has done to every province in Canada, you should legislate the co-operative pool out of the entire Dominion of Canada.

"The last man on earth who should dare to make fun of such a suggestion is the man who sets up a special farmer party in his own province so as to set up almost economic war and class war between the farmer group and the others.

"I am for farmer control. I am for farmer control of the farmers' business and throwing every speculative dealer out of all the provinces of Canada when they get enough support and strength to do it. It may be right that Alberta should not do it because Alberta has never set the pace for Saskatchewan and when Saskatchewan does it the farmers of Alberta will do it whether Henry Wise Wood likes it or not.

"You know, it's funny, but I have never been able to get along with men named Henry. There was Henry Ford and now there's Henry Wise Wood. Here is the head of the farmer party of Alberta. Who is he talking for? He speaks of the great speculative system which has been built up in Canada, the oldest system. Just as though they have not got enough men to talk for themselves. Have they ever been in a place where this Sir Gallahad had to come down on his white steed and act as their champion? Since when did the farm leaders of the province come to advise the growers from the standpoint of the speculative dealers? Whose voice are we hearing? Whose voice are we heeding, Henry Wise Wood's or the farmers'?

"Then he goes on:

Is the trade supposed to lose this property?

"Why?

Is the government supposed to indemnify the trade?

"Why? They still have their elevators and can act as your handlers. You surely have paid for them several times.

Or do the farmers who are asking for this revolutionary method propose to take the responsibility of indemnifying the trade?

"Surely not.

I might also ask who would indemnify the pool for its property if the government should decide to pass legislation compelling the farmers to deliver all their grain to the old established trade.

"Did you ever hear such a suggestion in all your lives by an alleged farm leader? He sure is 'old' if not 'grand.' He has certainly reached the stage where his thinking is muddled. Can you conceive of any government legislating out your pool, performing as it does its service for the farmers? Is not that unthinkable?

"Then he goes on:

I cannot conceive of the government undertaking to force the delivery of all grain to any one selling agency without also taking the responsibility or at least a joint responsibility of the control of that system. The old Canadian Wheat Board is an example of the simplest method. Neither the farmers nor the government want to revert to any kind of direct government control.

"I am against government control. I am against your wheat board. But your wheat board had one good thing. It had all the wheat in one hand and could make one policy for Canadian wheat but with a government board it could say it would make the price of your wheat contingent upon some political consideration and that is why I oppose it. But I want the same 100 percent control but exercised by the men who grow and own that wheat. We need not bother about what Henry Wise Wood says about this proposal because he will change his mind. He always has where the farmers' interest is concerned. He starts out by opposing it and then he changes his mind.

"Let me tell you something about the formation of the original Alberta pool. Some years ago I was asked to come to this province. I had been doing some co-operative work in the United States. We started to do some wheat organisation work and I was at Spokane and Mr. Elmore, the leader of the farm movement, introduced me to a man whom he said was a great Canadian farm leader. It was Henry Wise Wood.

"Mr. Wood asked me about this system that I was offering to the farmers, this pool control system. I explained it to him and he said 'That could not work in Canada; the people would not stand for it; it is wholly unnecessary; we could not think of using a pooling contract system for Canada.' He tried to make me feel like a one cent piece.

"I kept on pushing it all over the United States and later on I got a wire and a letter from Canada asking me to come here and explain the system. Who sent for me? Henry Wise Wood? Not on your life. It was a man by the name of Woods, not Henry Wise. It was a man named Woods from the Calgary Herald. It was from Mr. Imrie of the Edmonton Journal. They sent for me and asked me to come to Alberta and explain about the pool. I got a letter from Mr. Brouillette of Landis, Saskatchewan, and from Mr. McNamee, the president of the Farmers'

Union of Saskatchewan, and they asked me to come to Canada and explain the pooling system.

"I came to Canada on the invitation of the Calgary Herald, the Edmonton Journal, Brouillette and McNamee, the Farmers' Union of Saskatchewan. And so I came to Calgary. I met the premier of that day, Mr. Greenfield. Before that I had met Mr. Brownlee, now the premier. They were both in favor of this pooling idea from the start and they have never wavered.

"How did Henry Wise Wood stand? He was against your pool, against the contract pool. I said to Greenfield, how will we handle this man Wood because he is important. We talked it over. I suggested a meeting in the afternoon with the farmers. We had a luncheon in the hotel at Calgary attended by the business men. It was a most enthusiastic meeting.

"Then we had the farm leaders' meeting in the afternoon. I suggested that I be asked questions and I would answer them and we would see how Henry Wise Wood reacted to them and then if we got the farm leaders interested we would shoot it at Henry Wise Wood. I asked to be permitted to be chairman of the meeting.

"We had a most enthusiastic response from the business men. At that afternoon meeting of the farmer group I took the chair and told them I was going to be the whole cheese, chairman, talker and everything else, because I did not want anyone to take responsibility of being sponsor of this thing for the time being except the Calgary Herald, the Edmonton Journal and the Farmers' Union of Saskatchewan.

"After I had got through telling them about this pool idea I was asked question after question. I answered them. The attitude of that group was unmistakably sympathetic and you could see where they stood. When all the questions had been asked I said: now let's get together and get down to doing something. Let us organise a committee, appoint a chairman and secretary, and decide you will go out to the people of Alberta and Saskatchewan and get this pooling system established.

"I put it to a vote. They said yes and I nominated Henry Wise Wood as chairman. That's how he was kicked into the chairmanship of the Alberta pool. That is how he became converted to the pool. That is how he was kicked into the fatherhood of the people.

"You have probably seen that article that appeared in McLean's Magazine where it said 'Here is Henry Wise Wood who initiated the idea of the pool, the father of the pool'—the man who was kicked into the fatherhood. You know, that hurt my feelings. I think the worst thing a man can do is to steal the work of another man's brains. If he steals money it is not so important as his name and reputation.

"Here was the Calgary Herald, and the Edmonton Journal and the Farmers' Union of Saskatchewan, bringing the pool system into Canada. Who gets the credit? Why, the grand old man of Alberta who was against the movement when it came to Canada. Is that British or fair? But that is the thing they are sending out to the members of the pool, in pamphlet form, this article printed in McLean's Magazine.

"But worse than that. We had a discussion about elevators. Who opposed us getting them? Henry Wise Wood. Who put the thing through? Leaders like Brouillette and the farmers. The farmers said we own this pool and you instructed your delegates and they instructed the directors and the directors got into line. Now Henry Wise Wood professes to have thought of that first.

"Then came the question of the Kansas City pool meeting. Can you imagine your representatives going down there and saying we do not want a world pool? Can you imagine them saying we do not want

connection with any other countries? Can you imagine any leader not realising that the most valuable thing you can do if you get 100 percent control is to join hands with the Argentine? Can you imagine any one of your own men getting up at that Kansas City meeting and saying that he is against any such proposed combination with other countries? Henry Wise Wood did it because he is the grand old man of the Alberta farm movement.

"The purpose of the United Farmers of Canada was to wipe out old lines and get the farmers into one educational organisation for Canada. Who opposed it? Henry Wise Wood. Who did it? Your leaders and others.

"Every important step that you have taken thus far or will ever take that deals with fundamentals has first been opposed by Henry Wise Wood. Now that I know he is against my present proposal I am sure there is some good in it. If he had been for it I would have scratched my head and wondered if it was sensible because his record in connection with the pool is one of being wrong and coming in later on and claiming credit for the right work accomplished.

"Is this criticism the kind that should have come from a farm leader? It would have been better in the mouths of Richardson or Stewart when they speak for the speculative dealers. Henry Wise Wood! I think I'll drop that 'Wise' because he is not.

"I want to read you a quotation from a Canadian Press despatch dated from Calgary, September 12, 1929:

If Canada, with its limited amount of wheat, could exercise a real influence over world prices, it would seem evident that the inauguration of a universal pooling system of selling would enable the farmer to get the actual value of wheat as compared with the prices he had to pay.

"Who made that statement?

"Henry Wood. He made that statement two weeks ago when he was addressing a group of manufacturers at Calgary. Two weeks ago the universal pool was the only way in which you could get the full value for your wheat as compared with the prices you have to pay. What has happened between September 12 and September 24? Now you must not have it unless you take up a collection for the poor elevator owners and the grain men who may be put out of business if you create a universal pool.

"At one time Henry Wood did some good work in Alberta for which we should never forget him but in opposing this move by this sort of method he has forgotten his old record and he is now in the wrong pasture and is feeding the wrong kind of animal."



Shaw Library

3155

Sapiro

95016